

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Joseph Martin Swaringen,
Plaintiff,

vs.

Scottie Bodiford, Jail Administrator;
Corporal Whitner; Corporal Childress; and
James Dorriety, Ass. County
Administrator, Dept. Of Public Safety,,
Defendants.

C.A. No.: 4:10-2825-RBH

ORDER

Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se*, brings this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Plaintiff alleges that, prior to his arrest on the charges for which he is currently detained,

Defendants falsely arrested and detained him for failing to comply with conditions of bail.

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States

Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and

Local Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with this court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made, and the court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Neither party has filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983). The Court reviews only for clear error in the absence of an objection. See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct *de novo* review, but instead must 'only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.'” (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

After a thorough review of the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error. Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is adopted and incorporated by reference. Therefore, it is

ORDERED that Defendants’ motion for summary judgment [Doc. # 52] is GRANTED and this claim dismissed.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that all other outstanding motions are deemed MOOT.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ R. Bryan Harwell
R. Bryan Harwell
United States District Judge

Florence, South Carolina
April 30, 2012